



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,644	01/22/2001	Michael Eisenbach-schwartz	EIS-SCHWARTZ=13B	6853

.1444 7590 10/01/2002

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
624 NINTH STREET, NW  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER

BUNNER, BRIDGET E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/765,644

Applicant(s)

EISENBACH-SCHWARTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Bridget E. Bunner

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-5, 10-26, and 31-39, drawn to a method of preventing or inhibiting neuronal degeneration which comprises administering to an individual activated T cells which have been activated by Cop 1 or a Cop 1 related protein, classified in class 424, subclass 93.7.
  - II. Claims 1, 6-22, 27-30, and 31-39, drawn to a method of preventing or inhibiting neuronal degeneration which comprises administering to an individual Cop 1 or a Cop 1 related protein, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
  - III. Claims 1-5 and 10-18, drawn to a method for promoting nerve regeneration which comprises activated T cells which have been activated by Cop 1 or a Cop 1 related protein administering to an individual, classified in class 424, subclass 93.7.
  - IV. Claims 1, 6-9, and 10-18, drawn to a method for promoting nerve regeneration which comprises administering to an individual Cop 1 or a Cop 1 related protein, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- a. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Inventions I-IV are different methods because they require different ingredients, process steps, and endpoints. Groups I-IV are different methods requiring different method steps, wherein each is not required, one for another. For example, Group I requires search and consideration of efficacy of therapy of T cell administration to prevent or inhibit neuronal degeneration, which is not required by the other

inventions. Group II requires search and consideration of efficacy of therapy of Cop 1 protein administration to prevent or inhibit neuronal degeneration, which is not required by the other inventions. Group III requires search and consideration of efficacy of therapy of T cell administration to promote nerve regeneration, which is not required by the other inventions. Group IV requires search and consideration of efficacy of therapy of Cop 1 protein administration to promote nerve regeneration, which is not required by the other inventions.

2. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their different classification, separate search requirements, and recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A method of preventing neuronal degeneration or promoting nerve regeneration in the:

- a. central nervous system
- b. peripheral nervous system

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A method of preventing neuronal degeneration or promoting nerve regeneration which comprises administering to an individual an effective amount of the protein:

- c. Cop 1
- d. Cop 1 related protein

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A method for preventing or inhibiting neuronal degeneration in the central nervous system or peripheral nervous system for ameliorating the effects of :

Art Unit: 1647

- e. injury
- f. disease

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Art Unit: 1647

A method of treating neuronal degeneration which comprises administering to an individual an effective amount of T cells or Cop 1 wherein the treatment ameliorates the effects of the following injuries and diseases:

- g. spinal cord injury
- h. blunt trauma
- i. penetrating trauma
- j. hemorrhagic stroke
- k. ischemic stroke
- l. Diabetic neuropathy
- m. senile dementia
- n. Alzheimer's disease
- o. Parkinson's disease
- p. facial nerve (Bell's) palsy
- q. glaucoma
- r. Huntington's chorea
- s. amyotrophic lateral sclerosis
- t. status epilepticus
- u. non-arteritic optic neuropathy
- v. vitamin deficiency

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 19-39 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable



Art Unit: 1647

thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

7. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A method for preventing or inhibiting neuronal degeneration or for promoting nerve regeneration which comprises administering activated T cells, Cop 1, or a Cop 1 related peptide, wherein the Cop 1-related peptide is a random copolymer containing:

- w. alanine, glutamic acid, lysine, and tyrosine
- x. tyrosine, alanine, and lysine
- y. tyrosine, glutamic acid, and lysine
- z. lysine, glutamic acid, and alanine
- aa. tyrosine, glutamic acid, and alanine

Art Unit: 1647

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-10 and 19-31 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

**If Applicant elects Groups I-IV, one species from the nervous system group must also be chosen to be considered fully responsive.**

**If Applicant elects Groups I-IV, one species from the Cop 1 protein group must also be chosen to be considered fully responsive.**

Art Unit: 1647

**If Applicant elects Groups I-II, one species from the disease vs. injury group must also be chosen to be considered fully responsive.**

**If Applicant elects Groups I-II, one species from specific type of disease/injury group must also be chosen to be considered fully responsive.**

**If Applicant elects Groups I-IV, one species from the Cop-1 related peptide amino acid group must also be chosen to be considered fully responsive.**

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bridget E. Bunner whose telephone number is (703) 305-7148. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz can be reached on (703) 308-4623. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 872-9305.

BEB  
Art Unit 1647  
September 30, 2002

  
**GARY KUNZ**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**